

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS . Washington, D.C. 20231

	_		. Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/657,616	09/08/2000 590 04/07/2003	HIROKATSU MIYATA	35.C14776	2679	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA , NEW YORK, NY 10112			EXAMINER VO, HAI		
			1771		
			DATE MAILED: 04/07/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Annlinetic: No	Amplia4/-)	t		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	.011		
	Advisory Action	09/657,616	MIYATA, HIROKAT	SU		
		Examiner Hai Vo	Art Unit			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe			Iross		
Ther final cond	REPLY FILED 28 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE refore, further action by the applicant is required to a rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (lition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appenination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	THIS APPLICATION IN avoid abandonment of (1) a timely filed amend	I CONDITION FOR ALLOW this application. A proper re ment which places the appli	ANCE. ply to a cation in		
	PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) o	or b)]			
have b 37 CF (b) ab	<u> </u>	visory Action, or (2) the date s han SIX MONTHS from the m is FILED WITHIN TWO MONT ate on which the petition under hision and the corresponding and d statutory period for reply orig	ailing date of the final rejection. "HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION." 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate expropriate expropriate expressions are to the fee. The appropriate expressions or the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in		
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		•			
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:				
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/o	r search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appe	al by materially reducing or	simplifying the		
((they present additional claims without cance NOTE: 	lling a corresponding nu	umber of finally rejected clai	ms.		
3.[Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):				
4.[Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submit	ted in a separate, timely file	d amendment		
5.⊠	The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		peen considered but does NO	OT place the		
6.⊠	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed	SOLELY to issues which we	ere newly		
7.🖂	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:				
	Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>26 and 39</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>23-25,27-38,40 and 41</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8.		s a)□ approved or b)[disapproved by the Exan	niner.		
9.		(5)(

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The art rejections have been maintained for the following reasons. In the first place, the arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims, i.e., the claims do not exclude an embodiment where there are some defects in a uniaxially oriented mesoporous silica film. Secondly, Applicants argue that there is no inherent formation of a uniaxially oriented structure of the mesoporous film without the structured substrate. Again, this is not found persuasive because nothing about the oriented structure of the substrate has been included in claim 23. Further, the arguments that there is nothing in Ozin to teach the rubbing of high density polyethylene to provide any specific orientation of its surface are not found persuasive. The limitations of the rubbing of the substrate surface have not been included in the claims.

TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700